TRUTH11.COM

Virology is a Fraudulent Pseudoscience

Dylan Eleven
Aug 22, 2023 9 min



The Expose | Patricia Harrity

Is Virology a bonafide science? Not according to a biomedical scientist, who argues that Virology is a **Fraudulent Pseudoscience** and is a dying field.

Virology is Out of Control

Simon Lee, Science Officer at Anew UK.

Most people regard virology as a bona fide hard science. But is it really? Does virology follow the scientific method?

The steps of the scientific method include:

- Observe a natural phenomenon.

Subscribe

- Suggest hypothesis to explain the phenomenon.
- Select independent variable (the presumed cause).
- Select dependent variable/s (the observed effect/s).
- Control variables.
- Test/experiment.
- Analyse the observation/data.
- Validate/invalidate hypothesis.

Following the scientific method begins with observing a natural phenomenon, postulating a hypothesis, and then determining the independent variable (IV) which is the presumed cause, the dependent variable (DV) which is the observed effect, and controls for experimentation.

Scientific controls are used as a check and balance system in experiments when researchers are attempting to determine the cause of an effect. Controls are designed to ensure that the presumed cause (independent variable) is the only thing that could be causing the observed effect (dependent variable).

Controls allow one variable or factor to be studied at a time. It's crucial that both the control and other experimental groups are exposed to the exact same conditions apart from the one variable under study. This allows for more accurate and reliable conclusions to be drawn from the experiments.

Virology Refutes Itself

Virologists only starting natural phenomenon is people who have similar symptoms.

Up until 1952, virologists believed that a virus was a toxic protein or enzyme that poisoned the body and that it somehow multiplied in the body itself and could spread in the body as well as between people and animals.

However, these suspected viruses could not be seen directly in diseased tissue using electron microscopy. It was also acknowledged that even healthy animals, organs, and tissue released the same breakdown products during the decomposing process that had previously been misinterpreted as "viruses".

For decades virologists failed in their attempts to purify and isolate the assumed “virus” particles in order to directly prove the existence and pathogenicity of these particles. Virologists only had indirect evidence of decay from human and animal tissue culture experiments claimed to be caused by the “virus” in question. This same decay was seen in tissues from healthy hosts.

Different groups of researchers could not reproduce or replicate each other’s findings. In fact, results were often contradictory as a 1999 essay by Karlheinz Lüdtke points out:

“Findings often reported by certain virus researchers at the time were not confirmed by other researchers as a result of their own experiments, or the observations could not be reproduced by all scientists working with the virus. Often, findings to the contrary were reported, or the findings that had been examined were considered artefacts…Findings that were used to empirically confirm a suspected connection were often soon joined by negative findings reported by other researchers.”

Essentially, virology had refuted itself by this point.

The Cell Culture Method Rescues the Dying Field of Virology

In order to circumvent the proper scientific method, virologists have established the laboratory cell culture method to act as a pseudoscientific proxy for a natural phenomenon.

The cell culture method was introduced in 1954 by John Franklin Enders during his attempts to identify a measles “virus.” Virologists could not properly purify nor isolate the assumed “virus” particles directly from the fluids of a sick person, so it was decided that the particles should be “grown” in a laboratory cell culture instead.

They claimed that there were not enough particles present within the fluids of the host to enable direct detection. This is inconsistent with the notion that viral diseases are transmitted from person to person with infected people shedding billions of viral particles that infect others. Remember the ominous dark clouds surrounding the “infected” during the covid terror campaign?

The “virus” which could not be found directly inside the fluids in order to be studied properly, was assumed to need a host cell in order to replicate itself so that it could then be found and studied.

Enders observed what is called the cytopathic effect, which is a pattern of damage appearing in the culture as the cells break apart and die. This effect was assumed to be the direct result of the invisible “virus” within throat washings replicating inside the cells leading to cellular lysis.

He assumed that the pieces of cellular debris from a poisoned cell were the newly created “viral” particle copies. Despite the unscientific nature of the method, the cell culture was quickly established as the “gold standard” for “virus isolation” and is still used by virologists today.

The indirect cell culture method revived the dying field of virology. Enders was ironically awarded a Nobel Prize in 1954 for the evidence he had gathered using the old refuted tissue culture experiments which were subsequently replaced by his new cell culture method the very same year.

The cell culture method is pseudoscientific as it jumps into experimentation without observing a natural phenomenon, without identifying the dependent variable (the effect), or isolating the independent variable (the “virus”) in order to establish a hypothesis to test against.

As well as not having a valid independent variable i.e. purified and isolated “viral” particles, Enders also created his own dependent variable in the cytopathic effect. This effect is not a naturally observed phenomenon but is artificially created in the laboratory by experimentation.

It was assumed that the “virus” existed and that it would cause a cytopathic effect if added to a cell culture. This is what is known as an “affirming the consequent” logical fallacy, sometimes called “begging the question” or “circular reasoning”.

Even though the cell culture was accepted as the “gold standard” proof for the “isolation” of a “virus,” one thing that is often ignored is that Enders himself was uncertain whether his method was valid. In his 1954 paper, Enders questioned whether

the experimental results created in a lab (in vitro) were relevant to what happens inside the body (in vivo):

“The pathologic changes induced by the agents in epithelial cells in tissue culture resemble, at least superficially, those found in certain tissues during the acute stage of measles. While there is no ground for concluding that the factors in vivo are the same as those which underlie the formation of giant cells and the nuclear disturbances in vitro, the appearance of these phenomena in cultured cells is consistent with the properties that a priori might be associated with the virus of measles.“

Enders saw the same cytopathic effects he had associated with the measles “virus” in normal uninoculated control cultures without any “virus” present:

“It must be borne in mind that cytopathic effects which superficially resemble those resulting from infection by the measles agents may possibly be induced by other viral agents present in the monkey kidney tissue…A second agent was obtained from an uninoculated culture of monkey kidney cells. The cytopathic changes it induced in the unstained preparations could not be distinguished with confidence from the viruses isolated from measles.”

In other words, Enders established using uninoculated cultures that the cytopathic effect which he assumed was caused by the invisible measles “virus” was produced even when there was no assumed “virus” present within the culture.

Over the next five years, other teams of researchers found the exact same cytopathic effects as Enders did when they performed uninoculated controls for themselves.

It is clear that it is the cell culture method itself, which involves stressing and starving the cells which are removed from their natural environment and poisoned with toxic antibiotics as well as mixing in foreign animal substances and other chemicals, that causes the death of the cells.

As this cytopathic effect was not specific to a “virus” and occurred in cultures without any “viruses” present, it can not be used to claim the presence of a “virus”.

The invalid cell culture method was promoted as the gold standard that every virologist should use to confirm the presence of a “virus” in a sample. This cemented

the entire field of virology into a world of pseudoscience as the scientific method continued to be ignored.

In addition, mixtures assumed to contain invisible “viruses” were consistently demonstrated not to be pathogenic, so they did not meet the definition of a “virus”.

These revelations should have ended virology right there and then. Unfortunately, that did not happen.

Others Refute Virology

Recently, Dr. Stefan Lanka has performed experiments using the same protocols that have been used in every isolation experiment of every presumed pathogenic virus. This included changing the nutrient medium to “minimal nutrient medium” i.e lowering the percentage of fetal calf serum from the usual 10% to 1%, lowering the nutrients available for the cells to grow, thereby stressing them, as well as tripling the amount of toxic antibiotics.

Dr. Lanka observed the characteristic cytopathic effect but at no point was a pathogenic “virus” added to the culture. This outcome can only mean that the cytopathic effect was a result of the way the culture experiment was done.

He also added a solution of pure RNA from yeast which produced the same result, again proving that it is the culture technique—and not a virus—that is causing the cytopathic effect. It is interesting to note that during the recent construction of the alleged “monkeypox genome” Chinese Communist researchers used yeast genetic material during the process which incredibly did not even involve having any actual virus samples to work with.

In the infamous study by Zhou et al., which is one of the foundational pillars of the “SARS-COV-2” fraud, they state that a “mock virus” control was used. It is not clear from the paper what they mean by “mock virus”.

However, Dr. Mark Bailey investigated further and discovered that in the experimental culture, the antibiotics were doubled during the culture experiments to achieve a cytopathic effect in 1 out of 24 cultures. Not only is this a high failure rate to culture a

“virus,” but the addition of more antibiotics to the experimental culture completely invalidates the results as the control was not treated the same.

The addition of more antibiotics to the experimental culture was never mentioned anywhere in the paper. Zhou et al. committed scientific fraud. How many other “virus” studies have done the same? The details of what was done to the mock-infected controls should be provided with every paper but this does not happen.

Virology is a Fraudulent Pseudoscience

The cell culture method is not a valid experimental set-up as it was never designed according to the scientific method. The experiment creates the effect (cytopathic effect) and then assumes the cause (“virus”) without verifying that the assumed cause exists to begin with.

The cytopathic effect is known to be caused by many other factors unrelated to a “virus” thus making the explanation of a fictitious “virus” as the culprit unjustifiable.

It is known that the cytopathic effect can be caused by:

- Bacteria
- Amoeba
- Parasites
- Antibiotics
- Antifungals
- Chemical contaminants
- Age and cell deterioration
- Environmental stress

The cytopathic effect is not a valid dependent variable as it is not a naturally observed phenomena, and it can be explained by various factors other than an invisible “virus.”

The unpurified sample added to the cell culture is not a valid independent variable as the “virus” assumed to be within has not been shown to exist in a purified and isolated

state before the experiment takes place. Using the cell culture method as evidence for a “virus” is entirely unscientific.

Valid controls should be performed alongside the cell cultures every time. Usually, either no mention of the controls can be found within the studies provided as evidence for the existence of “viruses” or what was done to the control culture is poorly defined.

If virologists do perform a control, they usually do what they refer to as “mock” infections. What this means is that the virologists are supposed to use the same cell with the same additives but without the “virus” added.

A control is supposed to eliminate only the one variable under study, i.e. the assumed “viral” particles. As the fluids that are used to inoculate the culture do not consist of only purified and isolated “virus” particles but rather consist of a complex soup of substances such as host materials, bacteria, fungi, extracellular vesicles, etc., mock-infections where no human fluids are added to the culture are not proper controls.

A proper control would be to use a sample from a healthy human which is treated in the exact same way as the fluids with the assumed “virus.”

Leaving samples from healthy people out of the control invalidates the mock infection as there are numerous confounding variables present within the experimental culture that are missing from the mock-infected culture.

Virologists must attempt to observe a natural phenomenon where the independent variable can be observed in nature. At the very least, this means that they must find the particles that they believe are “viruses” directly in the fluids of a sick host and separate these particles from everything else within the fluids. Virologists must then determine a valid dependent variable in order to establish a testable and falsifiable hypothesis.

Virology has created its own lab-created variables rather than proving cause and effect through the study of any real-world phenomena. Using a lab-created effect to claim a cause that can not be observed until after the experiment takes place is the antithesis of the scientific method.

The “virus” is an imaginary construct dreamt up in the minds of researchers who regularly failed to find a bacterial cause for disease. They then assumed that there

must be something else smaller and invisible within the fluids of sick people.

Virology has its foundations rooted in pseudoscience as there was never any naturally observed phenomena to build upon except for people with similar symptoms. Virology is out of control.

References :

1) Virology's Lack of Control. Mike Stone. https://viroliegy.com/2022/12/19/virologys-lack-of-control/

2) Peng Zhou et al. "A pneumonia outbreak associated with a new coronavirus of probable bat origin", Nature, 579 (12 Mar 2020).

3) The Virus Misconception Part 1: Measles as an example. Dr Stefan Lanka. WISSEnSCHAFFTPLUS magazin 01/2020 · Auszug

4) The Virus Miconception Part 2: The beginning and the end of the corona crisis. Dr Stefan Lanka. WISSEnSCHAFFtPLUS magazin 02/2020 · Auszug

5) The Virus Miconception Part 3: Corona simple and understandable. Dr Stefan Lanka. WISSEnSCHAFFtPLUS magazin 03/2020 · Auszug

6) THE COVID-19 FRAUD & WAR ON HUMANITY Dr Mark Bailey and Dr John Bevan-Smith

7) A Farewell To Virology (Expert Edition) Dr Mark Bailey https://drsambailey.com/a-farewell-to-virology-expert-edition/

Original Article: https://expose-news.com/2023/08/22/virology-is-out-of-control/

Subscribe to Truth11.com

Receive Articles By Email

Subscribe now

Support Truth11.com • Make A Donation

• Become A Subscriber

Armed With The Truth • United We Stand